

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

THERESA CHIEFFALLO-CRAIG

v.

RELiance STANDARD LIFE INS. CO.

\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*  
\*

Civil No. – JFM-14-1199

\*\*\*\*\*

**MEMORANDUM**

In response to defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff's complaint, plaintiff (who is appearing *pro se*, has stated that he was not aware until June 27, 2014 about the limitations provision upon which defendant relies. Defendant has not filed a reply to plaintiff's response. Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is denied. Of course, if the factual record established after the conducting of discovery establishes that plaintiff should have been aware of the limitations provision, defendant may file a motion for summary judgment.

Date: 8/12/14

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Frederick Motz  
United States District Judge

FILED  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND  
AUG 13 4 38 PM  
CLERK'S OFFICE  
AT BALTIMORE  
BY